F W Holland

THE CONFLICT

BETWEEN

DARWINIANISM AND SPIRITUALISM:

OR,

DO ALL TRIBES AND RACES CONSTITUTE ONE HUMAN SPECIES?
DID MAN ORIGINATE FROM ASCIDIANS, APES,
AND GORILLAS? ARE ANIMALS
IMMORTAL?

BY

J. M. PEEBLES,

AUTHOR OF "TRAVELS AROUND THE WORLD;" "SEERS OF THE AGES;"
"JESUS — MYTH, MAN, OR GOD;" "SPIRITUALISM DEFINED
AND DEFENDED;" "THE SPIRITUAL TEACHER
AND SONGSTER," ETC., ETC.

BOSTON:
COLBY & RICH, PUBLISHERS.
1876.

9 Montgomery Place.

1877, Feb. 28.
Gift of
Rev. F. W. Holland,
of Cambridge.
(H. U. 1831.)

PREFACE.

THE tendency of modern thought, with a class of surface-thinkers, culminated in these conclusions: There is no conscious soul, no God, no providence, no blessed immortality. And Darwinian studies for years have helped on, rather than checked, this tendency towards a dark, doubting materialism.

But to exist in the nineteenth century is to think. And as no man loves to contemplate orphanage in the present, or nonentity in the future, *these* become constantly recurring questions, How did man originate? and, If he die, shall he live again?

Thanks to God and angels, Spiritual phenomena came in due time, — came to reveal the spiritual, rather than the animal origin of man, and to demonstrate the positive reality of a future conscious existence. And the following pages are written in the interests of Spiritualism, as against a wide-spread Darwinian materialism.

J. M. P.

THE CONFLICT

BETWEEN

DARWINIANISM AND SPIRITUALISM.

THE crown of physical nature is physical man. Ending the serial chain, he stands related to the deepest rock, the farthest star, the brightest angel, the infinite Presence.

Plato, in his beautiful "Hymn of the Universe," designates man as the "microcosm," the epitome, of the whole; thus anticipating, by more than two thousand years, the sublimest generalizations of modern science.

As in ancient times all roads led to Babylon the magnificent, so protoplasm and polyp, zoöphyte and quadrumane, *all* the lesser kingdoms, are but altar-stairs leading to the very pinnacle of Nature's temple. The primal atom, the crystal drop, the spring blossom, the humming insect, like the old signs of the zodiac, point prophetically to some portion of physical man. But physical man, though composed of all the elements below him, is not essential man, not immortal man. The shadow is not the substance, nor the cover the book.

As alchemy gave place to chemistry, so the word

'creation' must soon be displaced for that better term, '*evolution.*' But what is the order of evolution?

Is the procession from the seen to the unseen, from matter up to mind; thus making the lesser produce the greater, the rock originate the moss that covers it? Is it possible for unconsciousness to go up into consciousness, for the chilliness of death to ultimate in life, and for the animal to unfold into the Caucasian? If so, the Darwinian theory may be true. But Spiritualism, affirming that Spirit is causation, and recognizing a divine force superior to matter or any attribute of inert matter, teaches a philosophy directly the reverse of this. It puts spirit, as the energizing principle of the universe, first, and considers matter as the residuum of spirit-substance. Solid ice is only congealed water. Evolution implies something to be evolved from. The formula stands thus: Essential Spirit, spiritual substance, and physical matter, — *these* are the three factors that constitute actual being.

THE FIVE FORCES.

The most erudite of physicists recognize the existence of five classes of forces, — the *mechanical*, which made the earth an oblate spheroid; *chemical*, which composes water of oxygen and hydrogen; *vital*, that which constructs the organisms of plants; *psychical*, that which gives instinct and animal locomotion; and *spiritual*, that which evolves thought, design, and aspiration. The ancients were not wholly unacquainted with these forces. The Nyáya system, attributed to that distinguished Brahmin, Gautuma,

teaches the atomic theory, and evolves all things from one universal primordial substance. Both Hindoos and Greeks were the predecessors of modern evolutionists. At present there are two distinct schools of thinkers upon this subject, — the English material of Darwin, and the German spiritual of Haeckel. Herbert Spencer vibrates between the two.

It seems clear, that essential spirit, that is, the God-principle, interpermeating and acting upon centers of force, polarized atoms, germinal life-cells, and the various forms of matter, produced worlds, and those clusters of worlds that glitter in the interstellar spaces of infinity. At this remote period, our world was a liquid mass of fiery fluid. Then came the Plutonian incrustations, the granitic formations, the mineral, vegetable, animal, and human kingdoms.

THE ORIGIN AND UNITY OF THE HUMAN RACE.

Whence the origin of man? Was he miraculously made from the dust of the earth, some six thousand years since? Did he eternally pre-exist as a typal soul-germ awaiting incarnation on earth? Or is he the gradual outcome of apes, monkeys, baboons, chimpanzees, orang-outangs, and gorillas? And, further, are the human species — the African, Aryan, Turanian, Malay, &c. — one? This we answer decidedly in the affirmative. Though there are many tribes and races, there is but *one human* species; and all, whether Africans, Indians, or Aryans, constitute one brotherhood. The ethnologist is careful not to confound species with race. The different races evidently diverged north and south from vast groups of

primitive men appearing originally under the sunny skies of Southern Asia, and along that line of latitude through Central America.

In this almost infinitely remote era of time, the Eastern and Western Continents were united by land. Mutability pertains to earth. Since that distant period, lands have been displaced by seas, continents have been elevated, and islands have gone down into the depths of the ocean. The sinking of the Atlantis Isle, according to Egyptian priests, Solon, and Plato, occurred nine thousand years before Plato's time. Treating of the changes of the earth's polarities, M. Julien says, "Here, then, is an irresistible force, which, following the invariable law of the irregular precession of the equinoxes, must make the earth's center of gravity periodically oscillate."

If the human species is one, how do you account — is the inquiry — for the different races, with their different colors, white, black, copper, and olive? Here science must be the guide. Take coffee, says a French scientist. The coffee-plant was first found along the foot-hills of Abyssinia, that slope towards the Red Sea, something like four hundred years ago. It was borne from there, across the Red Sea, into Arabia, growing in great luxuriance, and from which locality we still get the famous Mocha coffee. While sailing up the Red Sea, some three years since, our captain pointed out to us the old town Mocha. From Arabia, this coffee-plant went through the East, then into Europe, and finally into the West Indies and Mexico; and, in thus traveling, it has become wonderfully modified in appearance, quality, and aroma. The Mocha, Martinique, Rio Janeiro,

and Java coffees are singularly unlike; and why? Climates, temperatures, and modes of culture, — these afford the explanation. Now, then, if climate and temperature can work such changes in coffee-plants, in a few hundred years, what may it not do in men during several hundred thousand years?

This French scientist, Prof. A. de Quatrefages (member of the Institute of France), takes as another illustration the wild turkey, native of our country. Something over three hundred years since, some Frenchmen, while examining the Western mounds, were charmed with the flocks of wild turkeys. Returning, they took a pair of them to Paris as an ornament for the park. Finding, ere long, that their food was delicious, they soon found their way upon the farms, and into the yards of the peasants. But, in traveling through France now, one is struck with the great variety of turkeys, large, small, brown, white, black, orange-colored; and all from a single pair. What the causes? Climate, temperature, food, and other modifying conditions. But if known causes produce such changes in birds, plants, and animals, why not in men?

Coffee, though differing in all lands, originated from the same coffee-plant. Roses, whether in Persia or Oregon, whether white, yellow, or red, are still roses. Turkeys in France and Europe, though varying in size, habit, and color, sprang from a single pair, and make but one species. This is true of men: there is but one species, one vast brotherhood.

The smallest known race is the Bushmen of Africa; the largest, the Patagonians; and the lowest races on earth are the "black men" of Australia,

living in hollow trees, the clefts of rocks, and rude huts. But did these Australian tribes "descend," or are they legitimate out-births from apes, baboons, and gorillas?

THE GENESIS OF MAN.

Are men nothing but transformed and perfected animals? Because apes, chimpanzees, and orang-outangs approach in some directions near an exalted manhood, are they really our ancestors? Evidently not. Types are eternal. Typal germs do not merge into each other. And, further, unlike or different species do not procreate, or reproduce their kind. It is conceded to be a universal law in nature, that the offspring of different species are infertile. Different species never glide into each other.

I am aware that certain materialists tell us that the microscope reveals the fact that the germ or ovum of fishes, serpents, quadrupeds, and of mankind, are indistinguishable in structure, and that, in the process of growth from the embryo, each passes successively through kindred stages of development. Taking this view of the subject, certain Spiritualists have advocated the non-immortality of infants; and others have justified themselves in producing feticide. "Why not," say they, "destroy the embryonic child while it is yet in the reptile stage of development?"

But does the human fetus in the early stages pass through the fish, worm, bird, and mammal appearance? And, if so, should appearance be confounded with *identity?* Appearances are flexible weapons in the hands of sophists. Because nitro-glycerine has

very much the appearance of water, and because brass looks like gold, shall we say they have common properties?

The voice of German physicists, the preponderance of scientific testimony, is decidedly against the assumed facts above referred to. Fredault, in reviewing Lamark, says,—

"It has been proved by the most celebrated naturalists and anatomists, that, if the human germ has a distant resemblance to a worm or a reptile, such resemblance is *very remote;* and on this point we must believe as much as we would of the assertion of a man who, looking at the clouds, should say he could discover the palaces and gardens of Armida, with horsemen and armies, and all that a heated imagination might fancy."

That eminent physiologist Flourens, treating of the nervous system as the foundation of the animal organism, assures us that,—

"These nervous systems differ in different animals ordained to different functions, each perfect in its kind. The plan, then, of each insect animal grade is different; and so is the typical idea which prescribes its formation and perfection. No animal can be considered the outline of another."

The learned Zimmerman says,—

"To affirm that one type is merged into and lost in another, is trampling upon fact, and putting at defiance all the principles of analogy."

Müller, than which no higher authority can be

[redacted]

quoted, thus forcibly illustrates the fallacy of the theory: —

"It is not long since it was held with great seriousness, that the human fetus, before reaching its perfect state, travels *successively* through the different degrees of development which are *permanent* during the whole life of animals of inferior classes. That hypothesis has not the least foundation, as Baer has shown. The human embryo never resembles a *radiate*, or an *insect*, or a *mollusk*, or a *worm*. The plan of formation of those animals is quite different from that of the vertebrate. Man, then, might at most resemble these last, since he himself is a vertebrate, and his organization is fashioned after the common type of this great division of the animal kingdom. But he does not even resemble at one time a fish, at another a reptile, a bird, &c."

Milne Edwards, referring to Geoffrey St.-Hilaire, says, —

"I am far from thinking, with some of his disciples, that the embryo of man or of mammals exhibits, in its different degrees of formation, the species of the less perfect of inanimate creation. No: a mollusk or an anhelid is not the embryo of a mammal arrested, any more than the mammal is a kind of fish perfected. Each animal carries with itself, from the very origin, the beginning of its specific individuality."

In a very exhaustive essay by Dr. Clark, upon "fetal development," read before the "Cambridge Physiological Society," England, and afterwards published, I find this: —

"There is not a shadow of proof that one order of ani-

mals can pass into another in the way of ordinary generation. . . . The brain of the human fetus does not at any one time precisely resemble in form or degree of life that of any creature whatever among the lowest animals."

Types are eternal entities. The acorn produces the oak-tree only, and so each its kind throughout the universe. All Darwin's cited cases, as in pigeons, are but improvements in varieties, and not the production of new species. And, further, these improvements are effected not by some inherent power in plants and animals themselves, but by the infusion of some new element or invigorating principle. And instead of Darwin's essential postulate being true, that an improved variety may produce a superior germ, the fact is, that it produces an *inferior* type.

Mr. Darwin traces our genealogy thus: —

"The early progenitors of man were, no doubt, covered with hair, both sexes having beards; their ears were pointed, and capable of movement; and their bodies were provided with a tail having the proper muscles. The foot was prehensile; and our progenitors, no doubt, were arboreal in their habits, frequenting some warm forest-clad land. The males were provided with formidable canine teeth, which served them as formidable weapons. At a still earlier period, the progenitors of man must have been aquatic in their habits; for morphology plainly tells us that our lungs consist of a modified swim-bladder which once served as a float. These early predecessors of man, thus seen in the dim recess of time, must have been as lowly organized as the lancelet or amphioxus, or even still more lowly organized." — *Darwin's Descent of Man*, vol. i. p. 198.

One of our Spiritualist authors, writing of the origin of man, says, "The Caucasian did not originate from the negro, nor is the negro a degenerate Caucasian; but both came from orangs of different color and character. . . . The Mongolian and the Caucasian . . . descended from different types of the orang."

These writers introduce us to men in the past covered with hair, to women with bearded faces, to men provided with tails, men armed with canine teeth, men direct from orangs, and down, still down to the amphioxus; and thence, down the scale, to larval ascidians, known in the old books as "sea-squirt." And this, *all* this, without a demonstrated fact to rest upon!

It may be that Shakspeare was the sublime issue of unthinking protoplasm; possibly the African giraffe got his long neck by stretching a short one up towards the tree-tops for browse; and I will not pronounce it impossible that Carlyle and Emerson made their way up through fire-mist, protoplasmic jelly, billowy lava, granitic incrustations, creeping vegetation, and patriarchal monkeys, to manhood: but I fail to trace the steps. And the Darwinian theory not only fails to bridge the chasms, and point to the connecting links between orangs and men, but the failure is even greater when attempting to explain certain phenomena relating to the spiritual nature of man. Mr. Darwin, conscious of these difficulties, says, —

"*I can never reflect on them without being staggered.*"

Such honesty is commendable.

For Mr. Darwin, as a thinker, we entertain a profound respect. His patiently gathered facts are invaluable; but his groupings of them are imperfect, and his missing links entirely wanting. Not in history, in observation, or fossil, can a sign of transitional species be found.

What seems so very inexplicable is, that Darwinians should everlastingly persist in deriving the greater from the less, thus putting the effect before and above the cause. It might be christened "the cart-before-the-horse" dogma. Consciousness can not arise out of unconsciousness, reason out of unreason, nor the absolute out of the finite. Marine ascidians do not ultimate into apes, nor apes become men; the physical organization does not create the conscious soul; the brain does not secrete the intellect; scientific discoveries and Miltonian poems are not bread and beef transmuted by chemical laws; "nothings and nobodies" are not on the way to intelligent men and women; cold inert phosphates can not be developed into thought, nor a dead ox into a living epic aflame with truth and beauty. Nevertheless evolution is true; and development means that the less thing, or life-germ, serves as groundwork and conditions for the influx of new and greater spiritual forces, whereby it is enabled to expand in the directions of its natural tendencies. Primitive man, several hundred thousand years since, perhaps millions, was no doubt low, coarse, and exceedingly gross in his organism, but still a man; and in him lay concealed future Bacons, Newtons, Humboldts, and Emersons, just as orange-groves lie hidden in the orange-seeds that lie scattered about our yards.

Darwinianism and evolution are not synonymous. Among the most zealous opponents of Darwinism, are some of the strongest supporters of evolution. As a theory, evolution is logical. Facts support it. There is no conflict between evolution and Spiritualism.

PANGENESIS AND SEXUAL SELECTION.

There are several subsidiary theories connected with Mr. Darwin's main position. The chief points are as follows: Every part of every living thing is ultimately made up of a vast number of "gemmules," or minute living particles, or organic atoms, each of which has the power of reproducing its kind. These "gemmules" may exert their reproductive powers, or they may pass on, in a dormant state, from parent to offspring for a series of generations. The theory supposes a general aggregation of all varieties of "gemmules" in each ovum and spermatozoön in the higher animals, and in each part capable of reproducing, by "budding," in the lower animals and plants; and, to effect such aggregation, there must necessarily be a free circulation of the "gemmules" from every organ through the system. They are further supposed to be transmitted from ancestors. These are Mr. Darwin's words: —

"In a highly-organized and complex animal, . . . the gemmules thrown off from each cell or unit throughout the body must be inconceivably numerous and minute. Each unit of each part, as it changes during development, — and we know that some insects undergo at least twenty metamorphoses, — must throw off its gemmules. All organic beings, moreover, include many dormant gem-

mules, derived from their grandparents and more remote progenitors. These *almost infinitely numerous* and minute gemmules must be included in each *bud, ovule, spermatozoön*, and pollen-grain."

The above hypothesis is little more than a speculation; and yet it is continually pressed into the service of the Darwinian dogma. The absurdity of its practical application can hardly be better shown than in the example given by Mivart in his "Genesis of Species." He says, —

"On the hypothesis of pangenesis, no creature can develop an organ unless it possesses the component gemmules which serve for its formation. No creature can possess such gemmules unless it inherits them from its parents, grandparents, or less remote ancestors. Now, the Jews are remarkably scrupulous as to marriage, and rarely contract such a union with individuals not of their own race. This practice has gone on for thousands of years; and similarly also, for thousands of years, the rite of circumcision has been unfailingly and carefully performed. If, then, the hypothesis of the pangenesis is well founded, that rite ought to be now absolutely or nearly superfluous, from the necessarily continuous absence of certain gemmules through so many centuries and so many generations."

"And to every seed its own body," wrote the apostle. This is true of plant, insect, animal, man.

"Whatever may be the composition that surrounds the roots of a plant, whatever may be the nature of the atmosphere into which it rises, if it live at all, it must be as a plant of the species to which it belongs. Its absorbent and assimilative powers can extract from its surroundings only those elements that are suited to its own specific

organization. It will preserve its color, its form, its fragrance; it will elaborate sweet or acid juices, fruits poisonous or wholesome, according to its nature. Where art has succeeded in disguising the form and fashion of its being, it will constantly tend to return to them. Its seed is in itself. Its growth and shape and products are prescribed. It cannot deviate from them without degenerating, and incurring the danger of final extinction. The vital forces involved in the germ can operate only in certain directions and modes; thus limited, they will under the right conditions develop into a type of being common to the species and peculiar to the individual."

THE GRADUAL GROWTH OF MAN.

"Omne ex ovo," is a maxim among scientists. Evidently all life is traceable to the egg, the monad, the germinal cell; and physical man, like all other orders, is formed out of the material furnished from lower conditions.

Essential man, implying body, spirit, soul, on his way to culture and national greatness, necessarily passes three stages of unfoldment. At first he is an individual thoroughly selfish, an Ishmaelite, a restless wanderer, a rude hunter, living by hunting and fishing, and upon spontaneous fruits and nuts. Such life required a vast territory for subsistence.

This is the case with our Western Indians. Their implements of stone, and poisoned flint arrow-heads, symbolized war and a low form of heroism.

At a later period, these rude people sheltered themselves in caves and overhanging rocks, and busied themselves in constructing bows and arrows and stone implements, laying the foundation of the "stone age."

The second step upward was that of the shepherd and trader. Portions of those primitive races soon discovering that the milk of animals was good for food, and their skins excellent for clothing, began to tame wild animals, gathering them into flocks and herds, and often moving from place to place in search of green valleys and fresh springs of water. This was the common method of life in the Vedic period of India. It was eminently nomadic. Abraham in a later period had his tents and flocks on the plains of Shinar. Arabic tribes live this life to-day.

The third form of society in the line of progress was when men, naturally industrious, turned their attention towards the vegetable kingdom, becoming tillers of the soil, and earning their bread by the sweat of their brows. This mode of life requiring less territory than hunting, less time than herding flocks, gave man better opportunities for making tools, constructing houses, engaging in trades, and occupying leisure hours in cultivating the mind. In this remote period, different tribes and classes began to unite for protection. Rulers took positions, hamlets sprang up, and a rude sort of society became a fact, with social interminglings, milder manners, and a glimmering appreciation of the laws of brotherhood. Thus it is seen, that, all through the dust-covered periods of antiquity, we can trace the steady progress of man.

DO BEASTS AND BIRDS PROGRESS?

Does the canary-bird, reflecting upon the past, yearly construct a neater nest? Are the songs of birds more musical now than when their warblings

in Grecian groves mingled with Plato's eloquence? Did the elephants of the Punic wars differ from those of to-day? Are the animals carved on Egypt's obelisks unlike those of the present? Do we see, dating from the earliest historic period, the least approach in animals to the standard of essential man? Not the least. "Rudimentary structures" in certain animals are not "prophecies" of use and function in important parts of other animals. It bespeaks no genealogical relationship, that the arm of the European, the foreleg of the ox, the paddle of the seal, and the wing of the bat, are all formed essentially on the same type. And there is not a particle of proof that the fins of the fish, looking towards, become the wings of the bird; or, that the "fore-feet" of monkeys prophesy of the hands of civilized man. That the "sap of the tree" foretells the "blood of man," is pretty poetry, and nothing more. And to say, as do Darwinians, that the "furrow, the plow, and the plowman are all of one stuff," is to indulge in a meaningless jumble, inasmuch as it makes the guiding mind, and the plow guided, — the cause and effect, — one. Animals progress on the animal plane, but not from ape-hood towards manhood.

It is in vain to suppose, with Mr. Darwin, that the continual exercise of such powers as animals possess, ultimately develop into those possessed by man. Our experience with the animal kingdom shows that their intelligence differs essentially from man's, being a closed circle ever returning into itself; while that of man is progressive, inventive, and accumulative. The conscious intelligence and moral attributes of

man can no more be correlated with any thing possessed by animals, than the vital phenomena of animals can be correlated with those of plants. Only the wildest fancy could incite one to believe that moral conceptions could be developed from the animal instincts of huge apes and gorillas.

THE TWO POSITIONS CLEARLY STATED.

Darwinian schools of thinkers introduce us first to slimy protoplasm, then to ascidians, and in after-ages to snarling hairy creatures living for indefinite periods in the dense forests of the Miocene and earlier Pliocene eras. After a long time came the rigors of the glacial age; and these ape-like creatures took to dens and caves. Hunger impelled them to seize and devour such weaker animals as they could overtake and master. Advancing through long decades, they no longer used their lower extremities in climbing trees, but, putting them to higher uses, began a sort of crouching walking. Their brains also enlarging, they became day by day more cunning and sagacious. Ambitious, they finally learned to use weapons of stone and wood, destroying their victims.

And so these hairy monsters, neither "beasts nor humans," grew; combining the habits of the bear, the agility of the monkey, with some faint glimmerings of the savage. The glacial period now long past, these man-like apes moved on and upward in the path of progress, leaping out of their orbits, parting with their coarse shaggy hair, whitening in their complexions to beautiful blondes, and finally dropping their tails as untimely fruit! This theory, having no use for a God, personal or impersonal, points Caucasians to hairy, tree-climbing apes, as their ancestors.

On the other hand, the Spiritual philosophy takes this view of the subject: Spirit is causation, force, life. All existence constitutes a magnificent unity. *The soul is the man;* and this soul, a divinely etherealized portion of the Infinite "over-soul," did not "descend," or, more properly, come up, through ascidians, apes, and baboons; nor did it in any sense originate from matter.

Spiritualism accounts for the appearance of man upon the principles of a rational evolution from germinal types — *types*, allied to the divine archetype, God.

The method of this evolution may be thus stated: The divine Spirit, moving upon *Kosmos*, — moving upon and interpermeating the mineral kingdom, the vegetable kingdom, the animal kingdom, sublimating matter, and quickening the life-germs related to each series in the chain of being, — was long preparing for the crowning work, man. And all these myriad years of time, typal man was waiting to take on physical form, as the acorn waits through the winter-time for conditions to start oak-ward. . . . The glacial period with its snows and ice had now passed away. Many of the formidable beasts of the tertiary period had disappeared in convulsions and revolutions. Suns were golden. Summers in tropical lands, leafy and perpetual, were crowned with ripened fruitage; while spiritual, magnetic, and electric forces, acting upon, refining, moulding, and shaping earthly elements into forms, — really *matrices*, — had so adapted conditions, that the divine soul-germ could become incarnated. Then transpired the divine descent of the heavenly into the earthly; and

monadic man, primitive man, commenced his mortal existence. Externally, he was necessarily coarse, gross, groveling; but the divine germ within, aflame with mental and moral potentialities and possibilities, prophesied of a higher perfected humanity, and all in harmony with natural law through evolution.

THE LINE OF DEMARKATION BETWEEN PLANTS AND ANIMALS.

This is distinct and well defined. The individual plant has not the locomotion enabling it at will to change localities, as have insects and animals. Plants can build up their structures from simple elements, while animals can so do only from organized material. Animals have in their nervous system a reflex action, and plants have not. Animals breathe out carbon while plants, especially in the sunlight, throw out oxygen. Prof. Wyville Thomson in a lecture at Edinburgh University, treating of the distinctions and line of demarkation between the vegetable and animal kingdoms, says, —

"One of the *higher* plants absorbs its peculiar food, and assimilates it by means of an enormously extended external surface of roots and leaves. An animal, on the other hand, receives its prepared nourishment into the interior of its body by a mouth, and then subjects it to complicated processes of digestion and assimilation in contact with an extended internal absorbing and secreting surface, of which special portions are organized for the performance of the several steps in the process, till at length the unassimilable residue is rejected.

"A *plant cannot assimilate pure carbon* or hydrogen or nitrogen: it seems that it can assimilate no elementary substance except oxygen, unless it be presented to it in the

nascent condition. An animal stands in precisely the same relation to the binary compounds, carbonic acid, water, and ammonia. However abundantly, therefore, it might be supplied with these binary compounds which actually contain all the elements necessary for its sustenance, it would surely die of inanition. In order to be capable of affording nourishment to the animal kingdom, these substances must be elaborated to the condition of ternary and quaternary compounds; and this can only be done in the cells of plants. This, then, is the broad and practical distinction between the vegetable and the animal kingdoms. Plants have the power of absorbing, modifying, and organizing inorganic substances, while animals are entirely dependent upon the organic substances thus prepared for their support. Taken in this sense, the distinction between the two kingdoms is most marked, and of the highest practical value; but when we set aside this one peculiar property, which is possessed only by some plants, and only by certain parts of those plants at certain periods of their life, and especially when we observe certain minute forms, of low organization, on the verge of either kingdom, it becomes absolutely impossible to assign any definite distinctive character. The character which is perhaps most palpable and universal, is that a mass of vegetable protoplasm is at some time during its existence, inclosed in a cell-wall, which is composed of cellulose, or some very nearly allied ternary compound. Animal protoplasm is rarely, if ever, confined in this way; that is to say, in nucleated cells, with cellulose walls, which are found in all plants, and are not found in the animal kingdom."

THE POINTS OF DEMARKATION BETWEEN ANIMALS AND MEN DEFINED.

In the infancy of chemistry, it was thought that chemical elements could be transmuted into each

other. The progress of knowledge has taught us better. And so the analogy drawn by certain scientists between the seed that produces the tree, and the germ-cell that ultimates in the infant, to unfold through a series of changes into man, is not legitimate, because confounding reproduction with evolution. A reproductive circle, once established, obeys certain definite laws; but how it can leave its orbit, and revolve in some other, without the introduction of other elements and other causes, has not been, and *can not* be, philosophically explained. Reproduction and evolution are exceedingly unlike. And, further: it sets all logical reasoning at defiance when it is contended that the mechanical and repetitive nature of an animal can pass over into the condition of an intellectual, moral, and aspirational being, believing in God and immortality. Animals progress as animals: men unfold as men. Two parallel lines never meet.

As there is a broad and practical distinction between the vegetable and animal kingdoms, so is there a distinct line of demarkation between animals and men.

"The greatest of living linguists, Max Müller, declares that 'Language is the true barrier between man and beast.' Aristotle said, 'Animals had voice; but man alone had speech.' Huxley assures us that "Brutes have feelings, but not conscious trains of thought.'

'Man alone uses tools for high and noble purposes.

'Man alone cooks and seasons his food.

'Man alone is capable of moral and spiritual improvement.

'Man alone understands and makes use of fire.

'Man alone tames and uses animals for service.

'Man alone employs the language of moral thought and reason.

'Man alone seeks to consciously comprehend himself, and the capacities of his being.

'Man alone can appreciate the abstract ideas that relate to moral law and moral duty.

'Man alone believes in God, a future conscious existence, and the soul's eternal unfoldment."

"Any anatomist," says Prof. Jeffries Wyman, "who will take the trouble to compare the skeleton of even the negro with that of the orang, can not fail to be struck at sight with the wide gap that separates them." The volume of brain in man compared with the orang-outang is as five to one; and, further, the human brain contains potentialities and parts not found at all in animals. The learned Sœmering has enumerated over "fifteen important anatomical differences between the brain of man, and the highest order of animals." To speak phrenologically, insects, birds, and beasts lack the moral nature, the top-brain organs of conscientiousness, hope, intuition, reverence, and spirituality. On the other hand, from the cranial dome of this sacred temple, man's immortal soul looks up to the infinite soul, "God all in all!" We speak of the "divine Plato," but never of a divine beast nor of a righteous animal; because righteousness, or right-doing, implies a moral notion and moral responsibility.

MAX MÜLLER *versus* DARWIN.

Max Müller, the leading linguist if not the profoundest scholar in the Old World, accused of dis-

puting the Darwinian theory because it reflected upon his proud position in creation, says, —

"The question is not, whether the belief that animals so distant as a man, a monkey, an elephant, and a humming-bird, a snake, a frog, and a fish, could all have sprung from the same parents, is monstrous; but simply and solely whether it is true. If it is true, we shall soon learn to digest it. Appeals to the pride or humility of man, to scientific courage or religious piety, are all equally out of place."

He continues, —

"It seems to me, that, even without the help of the differential calculus, we can put a stop to this argument. If a boy arrives by insensible graduation or growth at the stature of man, is the man different from the boy? The stature may be, the color of his hair may be likewise; but, again, what philosophers used to call the substance, or the *individuality*, or the personality, or what we may call the man, remains the same. If Darwinians really maintain that the difference between man and beast is the same as between a grown-up man and a boy, the whole of my argument is granted, and granted with a completeness which I had no right to expect. . . . But what is the kernel? I represented language as the *specific difference* between *man and animals*, without mentioning other differences which others believe to be specific. . . .

"I hold that animals receive their knowledge through the senses, because I can apply a crucial test, and show that, if I shut their eyes, they can not see. And I hold that they are without the faculty of abstracting and generalizing, because I know of no crucial test to prove that they can abstract or generalize. Those who have read my lectures, and were able to reduce them to a skeleton of logical statement, might have seen that I had adduced another reason, viz., the fact that general conceptions are

impossible without language (using language in the widest sense, so as to include hieroglyphic, numerical, and other signs); and that, as no one has as yet discovered any outward traces of language among animals, we are justified in not ascribing to them, as yet, the possession of abstract ideas.

"I never try to crush my adversaries by deputy. Kant, Hume, Berkeley, and Locke may all be antiquated, for aught I know; but I still hold it would be useful to read them, before we declare too emphatically that we have left them behind."

"I can not deny myself the satisfaction," says Max Müller, "of quoting on this point the wise and weighty words of Huxley: —

"'It is much easier to ask such questions than to answer them, especially if one desires to be on good terms with one's contemporaries; but, if I must give an answer, it is this: The growth of physical science is now so prodigiously rapid, that those who are actively engaged in keeping up with the present have much ado to find time to look at the past, and even grow into the habit of neglecting it. But, natural as this result may be, it is none the less detrimental. The intellect loses, for there is assuredly no more effectual method of clearing up one's own mind on any subject, than by talking it over, so to speak, with men of real power and grasp who have considered it from a totally different point of view. The parallax of time helps us to the true position of a conception, as the parallax of space helps us to that of a star. And the moral nature loses no less. It is well to turn aside from the fretful stir of the present, and to dwell with gratitude and respect upon the services of those mighty men of old, who have gone down to the grave with their weapons of war, but who, while they yet lived, won splendid victories over ignorance.'"

DO ANIMALS THINK AND REASON?

That animals have sensations, desires, and purposes, is evidently true. And, further, it is admitted that they reason: and so do plants; that is, they reason upon the plant-plane of vegetable existence. The sunflower turns toward the sun; the vine twines around the tree; oaks push their roots out and down towards the living stream; birds in autumn wing their way southward.

"But this is instinct," says the objector.

Very well: what is instinct but reason on a lower plane of life? God, who is essentially reason, power, and life, or the Life-Principle, is incarnate in all things. Accordingly plants, trees, and animals are aglow with a subordinate conscious life; and this they manifest in accordance with their organizations.

As previously stated, language is one of the lines of demarkation between brutes and men. We can not think consecutively only as we think in language. Try it. Parrots may be taught to imitate words, and dogs to bark for bits of bread; but man only arranges ideas, and then logically expresses them. It is absolutely impossible to teach the gorilla, or the "man-ape," to speak in a train of conscious thought; while, on the other hand, the babes of the lowest tribes of Australians or Africans, transported to England and brought up in that country, speak excellent English, and become fair scholars. Animals, though arrested developments lacking the soul-germs of men, fill their places, however, in the chain of being. Even insects subserve a useful end in the economy of nature. They subsist upon and appro-

priate matter grosser than themselves; and, thus appropriated, it is refined and taken up one gradation higher. But neither insects nor animals, so far as we know, aspire to any immortal existence; and yet aspiration is the measure of destination.

HAVE ANIMALS IMMORTAL SOULS?

Insects and animals destitute of the higher moral nature, possessing only physical consciousness, which can be felt only through the physical senses, would *not* naturally retain such consciousness after death. Adaptively designed for the earth, they have not the divine soul-germ, nor religious aspiration, nor the spiritual keystone in the crowning arch of the brain. That they have perception, thought, instinct, and reason, of a certain grade, is admitted; but they lack the incarnated atom, the self-conscious soul-center, that forms the basic foundation of the future immortal existence.

No logician affirms of a part what he does of the whole, or of the imperfect what he does of the perfect. And the human alone is the perfect structure. Insects, birds, animals — *all* are imperfect structures, arrested developments, unfinished arches, incomplete temples, hence have no conscious individualized life in the realms of immortality. When the creatures of the lower kingdoms die, earth goes to its kindred earth, and the spiritual substance constituting their spiritual structures reverts to, and is absorbed in, the surrounding ocean of spirit-substance, to form material for other and higher organisms.

If the toiling ox, whose dreamy eyes look so trustingly into ours, is destined to a future conscious exist-

ence, why fatten him for market? Or if the faithful cow, whose well-filled udder feeds our prattling babes, is immortal, why cut her throat, and, cannibal-like, eat her? If the oyster is on its way to an immortal home in the heavens, are we justified in forcibly opening its shell-house, and shoving it down, soul and body, into our murderous stomachs?

"But," exclaims the sportsman all wrapped up in the worldliness of the world, "I shall want my span of horses to trot along those undulating table-lands of immortality;" "I shall want my poodle-dog to pet," says the childless woman; and, "I shall want my nest of serpents," says the snake-charming juggler of India. All such kind of talk is quite as senseless as the chatter of children who persist in declaring that "rag-babies" are indispensable to their happiness. Sportsmen had better lift their minds above fast horses, and women would do well to wean their affections from poodles, before they cross the crystal river to witness the gorgeous glories of immortality.

It is a well-established fact, that, the lower and grosser the status in the scale of being, the more prolific. Plato died childless. Wayside weeds are exceedingly fruitful in blossoms, while the magnificent century-plant blossoms but once in a hundred years. The fecundity of insects is absolutely marvellous. The aphis, producing by gemmation, begets some 60,000,000 offsprings per year. The common spider produces 200 of its kind at a single brood; the ant of our country 5,000; the queen-bee lays in one season 50,000; a single oyster contains, according to Poli, no less than 1,200,000 eggs. The white ant of India produces, during a part of the season, 84,000

eggs each day; this is 2,592,000 in a month. These figures are not fictions, but solid facts based upon careful observation. And now, saying nothing of unnumbered millions of lions, tigers, hyenas, wolves, hedge-hogs, lizards, toads, and slimy serpents that inhabited the earth in the past, think, *reflect*, upon the countless myriads of aphes, oysters, ants, bees, wasps, flies, fleas, stinging mosquitos, and poisonous serpents on earth to-day; and believe, if you can, that they are immortal, destined to exist in the heavenly life. Why, they would form spheres of animals, spheres of spiders, spheres of immortal serpents, and vast concentric zones of stinging mosquitoes, absolutely measureless in extent; and, what is still more unpleasant to contemplate, mortals born into spirit-life would be necessitated to wade and wallow through these spheres of insects, these belts of lizards, and zones of spirit-serpents, on their way to the angels' home in glory, — the summer-land of immortality.

But "clairvoyants see animals in the spirit-world."

Quite likely. So they professedly see ships approaching us laden with gold, see oil-wells where there is no oil, lead-mines where no lead exists, and psychological pictures that have hardly a shadow of reality in them. When clairvoyance proves itself infallible, it will do to place in it implicit confidence.

Clairvoyance should never be confounded with psychological presentations.

"But 'spirits' say there are animals in the spirit-world."

Certainly they do. And other spirits, occupying different localities and more exalted conditions, say emphatically there *are* none, or none at least in those

celestial mansions of peace and purity that they occupy.

What now? Who shall decide? Both classes, speaking from their plane of observation, may tell the truth, and doubtless do. Oh, how indispensable the exercise of our own reason and judgment! That there is a higher order of animal life, and birds of beautiful plumage, in certain spheres of the hereafter life, is plausible and quite rational; but, if so, they are indigenous to those spheres, and not the products of earth's grossness. Angelic affections flow out to little children, glorified souls, and the Christs of the ages, rather than to insects and animals.

The ennobling idea of immortality did not germinate in the brain of an ape. Rather is it the outpouring force of a spiritual nature,—the budding potentiality that tells of a divine image, a fadeless eternity, and a God of infinite love.

There are two sets of modern philosophers. The one continually dabbling in matter, and putting body before soul in order of sequence, frames the formula: from *matter* to *spirit*. The other, considering the invisible the real, and seeing in soul causation, puts souls before bodies, and causes before effects. Life is the factor used by each class.

Admiring idealism, my sympathies are entirely with the subjective philosophy,—a philosophy that puts evolution in the place of creation, and pre-existence in place of the soul's descent from apes and other animals.

While essential spirit is as undefinable as indestructible, the *soul*, allied to the Infinite over-soul, is a microcosmal entity, in which lie the germinal possibilities of man's angelic destiny.

Earth though redolent in springtime, and golden in autumn, is to the devout philosopher little more than a cave of shadows touched by passing sunbeams. Surely our souls are prisoners in a foreign land. Starving, we feed upon the husks of earthliness, yet ask for angels' food. In comparative darkness we cry for light, the celestial light of the Christ-heavens. Weary, we plead for rest by the "tree of life," that shades the crystal river. And, in charge and under the supervision of our dear guardian angels, we are slowly feeling our way back to that pre-existent state of ecstatic bliss where love is law, and life a perpetual Eden. The sheaves we shall bear with us upon our return will be dearly bought experiences, shreds of wisdom gained, and the little purity attained. The return-steps heavenward may be denominated effort, aspiration, self-sacrifice, conquest of the passions, deliverance from selfishness, and a resurrection into the spiritual "walking in newness of life." After the Nazarene's spiritual baptism from the Christ-heavens, he could truly say, "I know whence I came, and whither I go." "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." "Be of good cheer: I have overcome the world."